	-
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	- 1
9	
10	1
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
	p 1

23

## BEFORE THE STATE OF INDIANA CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING OF OCTOBER 27, 2006

## ORIGINAL

## PROCEEDINGS

in the above-captioned matter, before the
Indiana Civil Rights Commission, Alpha
Blackburn, Chairperson, taken before me, Lindy
L. Meyer, Jr., a Notary Public in and for the
State of Indiana, County of Shelby, at the
Indiana Government Center South, Conference
Center, Media Center, 402 West Washington
Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, on Friday,
October 27, 2006 at 4:00 o'clock p.m.

William F. Daniels, RPR/CP CM d/b/a
ACCURATE REPORTING OF INDIANA
12922 Brighton Avenue
Carmel, Indiana 46032
(317) 848-0088

1	APPEARANCES:
2	COMMISSION MEMBERS:
3	Alpha Blackburn, Chairperson David C. Carter
4	Charles D. Gidney
5	Barry Baynard Tehiji G. Crenshaw
6	John E. Garcia
7	INDIANA CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION
8	By Gregory Kellam Scott, Director/Secretary & Christine Cde Baca, Deputy Director
9	Indiana Government Center North 100 North Senate Avenue, Room N103
10	Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 On behalf of the Commission.
11	
12	OTHER COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:
13	Stephen M. Tilden Robert D. Lange
14	Eric Chandler Tawanda Sharp
15	
16	ALSO PRESENT:
1.7	Renee Schoettle James Schoettle
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
1	

1	4:00 o'clock a.m. October 27, 2006
2	
3	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Good late
4	afternoon, everybody. We are now in public
5	session. The Indiana Civil Rights Commission
6	reconvenes to conduct its public meeting.
7	You have the minutes of the
8	September 15th meeting. May I have a motion to
9	approve those?
10	COMM. CARTER: I have a question
11	about the minutes
12	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: All right.
13	COMM. CARTER: and that is: On
14	the third page, under Report from Commissioners
15	on Complainant Appeals, second paragraph,
16	apparently I made a recommendation, but I
17	wasn't there.
18	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: You're an
19	extremely talented Commissioner.
20	COMM. CARTER: Well, a bit of
21	slight of hand.
22	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Yes.
23	MR. SCOTT: Well, that certainly

```
1
        has to be corrected.
 2
                     CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Well, we'll
 3
        clarify that.
 4
                Are there any other corrections that --
 5
                    MR. SCOTT: We'll have to take it
 6
        to the Attorney --
 7
                    CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: -- the
 8
        minutes require?
 9
                         (No response.)
1.0
                    CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Hearing --
11
                    COMM. CARTER: While I have the
12
        floor --
13
                    CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Please.
14
                    COMM. CARTER: -- if I could
15
        request an agenda change.
16
                    CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN:
17
                    COMM. CARTER: And that is: Under
18
        H, I have an appeal that is not listed, Francis
19
        Spencer versus MJM Investigations.
20
                    CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Okay.
21
                    COMM. CARTER: So --
22
                    CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Do you have
23
        a report on that?
```

1	COMM. CARTER: Yes.
2	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Thank you
3	very much.
4	May I have a motion to approve the
5	minutes with the amendments suggested, the
6	corrections
7	COMM. CARTER: So moved.
8	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: that
9	have been and a second?
10	COMM. GIDNEY: Second.
1.1	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: All in
12	favor?
13	COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.
14	COMM. CARTER: Aye.
15	COMM. BAYNARD: Aye.
16	COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.
17	COMM. GARCIA: Aye.
18	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Anyone
19	opposed?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Thank you.
22	Next on the agenda is the financial
23	reports. Is there anyone who would like to
Ц	

speak to the financial reports?

MR. CHANDLER: Good afternoon.

I believe everybody's got a copy of the report at this time, and you've probably had a chance to review it. As you can see, there's a summary of all of the current balances as of September 30th, the ending of the first quarter, which reflects the ending balances for all of the fund balances that we have ending of 847, 848. All of the pages following in that give you the detailed breakdown of each of the fund balance accounts.

Following that, you've got pie charts that give you a breakdown of all of the expenses and how they were broken down percentage-wise for each one at your discretion to look at. Most of the accounts didn't have much activity or no activity at all, other than the operating account itself.

And unless there were any particular questions on anything, that pretty much summarizes the report.

MR. GARCIA: I have a --

1.4

2.0

1 MR. SCOTT: There was one question 2 that is -- oh, I'm sorry. 3 MR. GARCIA: Oh, that's all right. 4 You probably can ask that question. 5 MR. SCOTT: In looking at the --6 there was a question raised regarding the 7 personal service versus -- I think it was 8 services other than personal. 9 MR. GARCIA: 1.2. 1.0 MR. SCOTT: Yeah, 1.1 and 1.2. 11 MR. CHANDLER: Uh-huh. 12 MR. SCOTT: And just if you could 13 briefly indicate the distinction between each 14 one. 15 MR. CHANDLER: Between the two? 16 MR. SCOTT: Yes. 17 MR. CHANDLER: In the operating 18 account, the personal services, the .1, those 19 are basically salaries that you've got in that 20 account. All of our personnel services are in 21 there, and your .2, where you've got your 22 services that are other than personal, those

are basically going to be contract services

1 that we have that we've done with anybody in 2 there. 3 COMM. CRENSHAW: Huh-uh. 4 CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: 5 COMM. CRENSHAW: Yeah, they're 6 maybe services on contract. 7 CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Well, you 8 have services by contract as another pie slice, 9 so --1.0 MR. CHANDLER: In here? 11 MR. SCOTT: Yeah, that's .2. 12 CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: 13 question is: What is the distinction between 14 those two categories of expenses? 15 MR. CHANDLER: Personal services --16 MR. SCOTT: Basically the 1, 2 17 and 3, because some of the services I'm 18 assuming would not be necessarily by contract. 19 MR. CHANDLER: Yeah, they're not, 20 not all of them are by contract, because it's 21 kind of iffy the way they do it. It's actually 22 kind of weird. Some of them, you're talking --23 like we've got a temp that works for us at our

1 front desk. That's a personal service. That's 2 a .2. Sometimes we've got --3 MR. SCOTT: No, that would be .1. 4 MS. CDE BACA: No, because it's --5 MR. CHANDLER: No, that's .2. 6 MR. SCOTT: Okay. Services other 7 than personal. 8 MR. CHANDLER: .1's are all 9 salaries. 1.0 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 11 MR. CHANDLER: Those are strictly 12 salary positions. Those are all salary 13 positions. Those are all of the individuals 14 that are employed by ICRC. .2's are people 15 like temps and whatnot that we have. 16 would be .2. 17 .3, where you've got contracts, those 18 may be people like we've got outside people 19 that come in that may do work for us, like 20 we've had people in the past that have been 21 database services and whatnot for us and, well, 22 of course, they help with databases and we've

actually done a contract with them, with actual

1 individuals. 2 Those are services by contract, where we've actually done a contract, they've signed 3 4 a contract and we've signed a contract for a 5 fee. Those are contract services, where we've 6 actually specified a dollar amount, that we 7 would pay them a fee for services that they are 8 doing on behalf of ICRC. So, those are 9 contract services. 10 COMM. CARTER: So, are we .2's, for 11 instance? 12 MR. CHANDLER: Correct. 13 COMM. CARTER: That's the 14 reimbursement service? 15 MR. CHANDLER: Correct. 16 COMM. CARTER: I understand it. 17 CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Does that 18 clarify it for you? 19 MR. GARCIA: Yeah, it probably 2.0 should be personal services other than .1. 21 CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Any other 22 questions? 23 (No response.)

MR. CHANDLER: And the only reason that they are as they are designated on here is because that's how the state has them on the chart of accounts, and that chart of accounts has not been updated for years, and it really needs to be.

MR. GARCIA: Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Okay. I presume we've covered items 1, 2 and 3. All right.

Next on our agenda, then, is New
Business. And most of us already know that on
November 17th, we intend to meet in Richmond,
Indiana as part of our new initiative, but
ongoing initiative, to bring the Commission
closer to the people around the state.

Next is our annual report.

MR. SCOTT: And for this year, the Commission will be submitting an annual report, and that report will reflect on what has occurred actually for a period larger than 12 months, but will indicate the various accomplishments, the challenges ahead of us,

and also the goals and objectives that the Commission has in the foreseeable -- well, I shouldn't say foreseeable future. All is foreseeable, but over the immediate future, and the application of resources, you know, assuming they're provided by the General Assembly on the same level they've been provided in the past, or indicate an additional request that might be made.

CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Okay. And the Martin Luther King, Jr. Commission, cost-sharing concern?

MR. SCOTT: The cost sharing on the Martin Luther King, Jr., when the Martin Luther King, Jr. Commission was created, the Department of Commerce and the Civil Rights Commission were required to provide expense -- cover expense for the Commissioners. The Department of Commerce later was -- the name was changed and the mission changed, and about that same time, the responsibility for those expenses was transferred from the Department of Commerce, by name, to the Lieutenant Governor's

1 Office.

1.0

1.8

And we have not received -- we don't have a memorandum of understanding between the two agencies, or at least between the Lieutenant Governor's Office and our agency, and so we're engaged now in discussions with respect to arriving at what would be a reasonable interpretation by both agencies as to how we would carry out that statutory charge.

CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Included in the charge, either at the time or since then, has been the Holocaust Observance. Would that also be one of the items which we'd be trying to seek clarification on, how to defray the expenses?

MR. SCOTT: Well, only to the extent that it actually reaches the cost for -- or expenses of Commissioners, not programming dollars. Unfortunately and for whatever reason, the legislature has not provided any funding whatsoever for the programs that are conducted by the Martin Luther King Holiday

Commission.

What we have done in the past is we have utilized the wizardry of the various directors, deputy directors, and the individuals in finance to try to find funds that are available that can then support the program, but the legislature has never provided any programming funding for that Commission, and all it has provided are two forms of support.

One is, at least today, the Lieutenant Governor's Office and the Civil Rights

Commission are to pay the costs and expenses for the Commissioners to come to meetings.

They're not salaried. Those would just cover the per diem as well as their travel expenses.

CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: My question went to --

MR. SCOTT: And then two was -- CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: I'm sorry.

MR. SCOTT: -- the second one --

CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Go ahead.

MR. SCOTT: -- the second one is:

1 We are required by that same statute to provide 2 staff support to that Commission. 3 CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: My question 4 went to the Holocaust Observance. Are you 5 suggesting that there are no expenses in 6 connection with that Observance? 7 MR. SCOTT: No, not at all. There 8 are significant expenses with respect to that, 9 and that is within the intent of the 10 legislature when the King Commission was 11 organized, that was not solely for 12 commemoration of Dr. King, bt it was intended 13 to be more a recognition of his work and his 14 concern in terms of how individuals are treated 15 within our society. 16 CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: May I 17 suggest --18 MR. SCOTT: And so, the Holocaust 19 then becomes a part of that. 2.0 CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: 21 suggest, then, that this item 3 include at 22 least some mention of that program, which is a

significant program for our community and

shouldn't be ignored as part of what we are now providing?

MR. SCOTT: Well, I certainly will do that, but I know already that has not one that they -- is not one that they impart, because the statute is so specific that it states that the Lieutenant Governor's Office and the Commission is to reimburse the expenses for the per diem and the travel of the Commissioners. It does not say anything else --

CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: About -
MR. SCOTT: -- in terms of -
CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: -- any

program?

MR. SCOTT: About any programs whatsoever, and where they thought we would manufacture the money or find it or come up with it is -- I'm at a loss for that, other than in one thing, and that is: They do allow the Commissioners of the King Commission to go out into the private sector and seek support and funding and et cetera. And we are going to

be doing that.

However, one of the reasons -- as we do that, we're going to make it clear that the reason we are seeking that support is because the legislature has not provided funding otherwise to the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Thank you. Any questions about that?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: The next agenda item is Old Business. Does someone want to speak to the issue of the minutes?

MR. SCOTT: Yes. The issue with the minutes -- and we have to now certify within the minutes that when there is a -- well, now they're required to do that -- when there is an executive session, that the executive session only cover those areas permitted by the Open Access Law, and so we will be modifying the form of the minutes so that that statement will be included in the form of the minutes.

CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Okay.

1	Consent agreements. We have Campbell
2	versus American Window & Glass, Inc. May I
3	have a motion to accept that agreement?
4	COMM. CRENSHAW: So moved.
5	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: And a
6	second?
7	COMM. CARTER: Second.
8	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: All in
9	favor?
1.0	COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.
11	COMM. CARTER: Aye.
12	COMM. BAYNARD: Aye.
13	COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.
14	COMM. GARCIA: Aye.
15	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Anyone
16	opposed?
1.7	(No response.)
18	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: And we have
19	proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law
20	
	and order for vote and signature now. The
21	first is Gray versus Zakrowski.
22	COMM. CARTER: Madam Chair, in the
23	case of Gray versus Zakrowski, I move that the

1	Commission enter an order overruling
2	Complainant's objections and adopting the
3	proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law
4	and order entered by the Administrative Law
5	Judge.
6	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: May I have
7	a motion to accept that?
8	COMM. BAYNARD: Second.
9	MR. GARCIA: So moved.
1.0	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: All in
11	favor, please.
12	COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.
13	COMM. CARTER: Aye.
14	COMM. BAYNARD: Aye.
15	COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.
16	COMM. GARCIA: Aye.
17	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Anyone
18	opposed?
19	(No response.)
20	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Thank you.
21	The case of Dugger versus Jimmy John's.
22	MR. GARCIA: In the case of Dugger
23	versus Jimmy John's/CPD Ventures, Inc., I move

	ll .
1	that the Commission enter an order overruling
2	the Complainant's objections and adopting the
3	second proposed findings of fact, conclusions
4	of law and order entered by the Administrative
5	Law Judge.
6	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: May I have
7	a motion to accept the recommendation?
8	COMM. CARTER: So moved.
9	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: And a
10	second?
11	COMM. CRENSHAW: Second.
12	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: All in
13	favor, please.
14	COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.
15	COMM. CARTER: Aye.
16	COMM. BAYNARD: Aye.
17	COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.
18	COMM. GARCIA: Aye.
19	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Anyone
20	opposed?
21	(No response.)
22	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Thank you.
23	I want to move now to the Report by
	1

	13
1	Commissioners on Complainant Appeals, and begin
2	with Comm. Baynard.
3	COMM. BAYNARD: Yes, Madam Chair.
4	I have two cases. In the case of Mustaklem
5	versus Brooks Bend & the Groves Homeowners
6	Association and East-Miller versus Crown Point
7	Community School Corporation, I recommend that
8	we uphold the Director's finding of no probable
9	cause.
10	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: May I have
11	a motion to accept that recommendation?
12	COMM. CARTER: So moved.
13	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: And a
14	second, please?
15	MR. GARCIA: Second.
16	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: All in
17	favor, may I hear the sign of aye?
18	COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.
19	COMM. CARTER: Aye.
20	COMM. BAYNARD: Aye.
21	COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.
22	COMM. GARCIA: Aye.
23	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Anyone

1 opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Thank you.

Comm. Garcia, in the case of Schoettle versus Perry Meridian Middle School, we have in attendance at the Commission meeting today

Renee Schoettle and James Schoettle.

And I understand that one or both of you would like to make a statement before the Commissioners.

MS. SCHOETTLE: Yes. My name is
Renee Schoettle. I'm a 20-year teacher here in
Indianapolis. I'm a mother of four children,
and my son Andrew, who this is about, is now a
sophomore at Perry Meridian High School, and
for the record, this is for Perry -- this
complaint was against Perry Meridian -- or
Perry Township, not the Middle School.

When Andrew was in the seventh grade -- and as I said, he is now a sophomore -- is when I submitted this complaint. We received the findings this past fall, and I just wanted to make some statements about what was said in

1 here to set some things straight.

And for everybody that may not know about this, my son has cerebral palsy. He was born with it. He is very capable through therapy since he was 13 months old, going through therapy twice a week. Now we're once a month, still having to work on range of motion and concerns about surgeries and whatnot.

But to get back to this, he wants to participate in after-school activities, one being an athletic activity. He is capable, he's able, and the township is excluding him because of his disability, and I firmly believe this.

I work with children with disabilities.

I work very hard as an educator to make sure that I am always being fair and equal. I question myself every day with all of my students, and I always wonder, "What could I have done better?" And I know I will never be that perfect teacher, but I always will strive to, and I feel that anyone in education needs to be that way.

If we are going to bring up and educate all students to be the best that they can be and to become citizens that will be beneficial to our society, every part of education for a child is important for their character, to build it, and when you take something away from a child that wants to be a part of something, I

have a problem with that.

equal opportunity in middle school to these children through ranking. Well, he did, except scores didn't count. He placed these students where he felt they needed to be. It wasn't about their score. But looking at my child, who has a disability, he felt he could never perform for the high school and placed him at the bottom of the list. So, I wanted to clarify that.

So, challenges worked after he placed where he wanted them though coach's discretion. Challenges did not occur until the last two weeks of that seventh-grade year, only because we questioned why they weren't happening, so

they did not occur the entire season.

Another thing I would like to say: If Andrew would have been placed where he should have been due to score, we would not have had this issue. He ranked fifth or sixth due to his score, and was placed 11th, coach's discretion. If the challenge matches were about score and score only and participants were placed according to their score, then challenge matches would be acceptable. It's stated here that you found that challenge matches should be discontinued. If they're used properly, they work, especially when it deals with score.

My last statement: At this time, Perry Township has continued their discretionary behavior. We just left the meeting two weeks ago. Andrew now has a 504, and we meet every year with the teachers. They kept the golf coach out of this meeting, claiming they had not hired him.

We had a second meeting with the athletic director at the high school. The

criteria that they're using now -- because the findings here is that there is no probable cause. As such, that they are making Andrew go through more hoops than ever before, and their attitude is very arrogant, as if it's okay to discriminate and exclude. If you don't fit in the box, you don't belong, and that is basically the attitude they have given us.

We were told that the 504 stops at 2:20, the end of the school day. We all know that's incorrect. What they're trying to tell us is: If we pursue this any more, Andrew may not be on this team.

I am concerned with the way that this message is being relayed to all children and all students. If a coach can decide by dubbing a participant "that you can play" and "you cannot play," what message is that sending our youth? Is it sending hard work, doing your personal best, or is it "If you play the game and the coach likes you --" or the teacher, because remember, these coaches are educators, what message is that sending?

\_ -

After-school activities are an extension of the school day. Their behavior does have a disparate impact. I wonder what's going on in this school day. That's my concern as well.

Very much. Is that all that you'd like to -
MR. SCHOETTLE: I want to say a few
things. I don't know that I can add much to
what my wife Renee has said to try to convey,
you know, what's happened. I try to look at
this, you know, in as legal a perspective as
I'm capable of doing, not being a lawyer and
not having the background of law.

I've looked at the Americans with

Disabilities Act, I've looked at the

Rehabilitation Act, and as far as I can

determine, based on what's gone on over the

last four years, the law should protect -- let

me compose myself.

(Pause in proceedings.)

MR. SCHOETTLE: It's been a very
emotional four years, and it's difficult for a
parent. I apologize.

MR. SCOTT: No apology necessary,
sir.

MR. SCHOETTLE: Take the emotion out of it; okay? I just feel that the law should protect my son, and it may be about something that it's not. See, it's not about playing time. It's not about sport. It's about hurting a child, my son, hurting a child, and it's big time, and they've hurt me, my wife, and my entire family.

It's not that important that Andrew plays golf on his high school team. It's just important that he's treated fairly. My wife and I have the resources to take him to the golf course to play any golf courses he wants to play. There's other venues where he can play golf. That's not what this is about. It's about Andrew's rights.

He's 15 years old. This has been going on since he was 11. He was born with cerebral

palsy. He can't do anything about that. All that we can ask is that the law protect him, because that won't go away. It won't change. He will live with that all of his life, and it's our jobs as parents to try to protect him and teach him how to deal with that, and that's what this is about.

And to allow them to continue their behavior sends the wrong message. As far as I can determine, as I said -- and I'm not a lawyer -- the law should protect Andrew, and I'm asking the law to do that. That's all I'm asking for. I've been portrayed as a lot of things by this administration over at the school, but all that I am is an emotional father who cares about his son and wants the right thing done. And that can only be done through the law.

CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: And we thank you for your statement.

Commissioner Garcia has reviewed the appeal.

Do you have a recommendation to make?

COMM. GARCIA: I'll be brief; okay?

But I can understand what they're -- what
they've just said.

And that's one of the reasons I didn't want to call you, because I didn't want to introduce any new evidence. This was on appeal. At the time you made the complaint — and I think that may be an issue here now. I think you bring up some issues that this may be an ongoing problem, and I think the issue here was what happened in seventh grade.

And I think that a lot of school systems do what you're saying, and I think since the Deputy Commissioner has taken on this education issue a little bit stronger than other Commissions have in the past, I think I'd like to remand the case back for further review and maybe amend the complaint to include subsequent years. I'm not a lawyer either, but I think that's something we ought to look at. You don't have to be disabled to be looked upon as a weaker competitor.

MS. SCHOETTLE: Absolutely right.

COMM. GARCIA: And I think what happens, sometimes coaches look at that, and you have to think like a coach sometimes, too. You have parents that are zealots, that when they do have a good athlete, they look at the coach as to "Why'd you take him out of the game? He should play the entire game. So, the coach has to balance a lot of those issues, so you have to look at it from the coach's perspective, too.

A lot of times politics and other things get into it, but you don't have to be disabled to be looked upon as a weaker competitor, and I think that plays into a lot of people that aren't disabled, and it gets back to what the Deputy Commissioner indicated in her -- in the last paragraph, the last paragraph of her recommendation, was that the Respondents strongly encourage them to discontinue the practice of the challenges.

Well, my kids compete in challenges.

Sometimes I don't agree with -- I always don't agree with the fact that there aren't any

1 guidelines as to how the challenges are 2 supposed to be conducted, and it's upon the 3 discretion of the coach. So, I can understand 4 that, and perhaps maybe not discontinue the 5 practice. I think challenges are good, but 6 there should be guidelines. And I think that 7 the school system ought to be encouraged to set 8 some guidelines. 9 MS. SCHOETTLE: They did, all by 10 visual. 11 COMM. GARCIA: Well --12 MS. SCHOETTLE: Yeah, I know. 13 COMM. GARCIA: -- I don't know that 14 any guidelines were written. I didn't see any 15 evidence of any guidelines --16 MS. SCHOETTLE: You're right. 17 COMM. GARCIA: -- that were 18 written. 19 MS. SCHOETTLE: Not for this one, 20 you're absolutely right. 21 MR. GARCIA: So, I would recommend 22 to the Commission that we remand this case for 23 further review in light of the extra evidence

I want to

1 that we've just heard. 2 CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: 3 thank you for being here today, because I think 4 you certainly shed a different light on the 5 appeal that is not necessarily -- that has not 6 necessarily been adequately reviewed or 7 expressed in the written documentation. 8

And our purpose here is to try to effectuate a fair and good judgment from the standpoint of the law, and also to broaden the understanding and sensitivity of the system that we see flaws in terms of the way it is supporting our students and -- or lack of support for our students in any number of areas, and we're looking into that.

With that, let it be said that the case, your case will be remanded for further consideration.

May I have a second to that recommendation?

> COMM. CARTER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: And all in

favor?

22

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.
2	COMM. CARTER: Aye.
3	
	COMM. BAYNARD: Aye.
4	COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.
5	COMM. GARCIA: Aye.
6	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Anyone
7	opposed?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Thank you
10	very much.
11	MS. SCHOETTLE: Thank you.
12	MR. SCHOETTLE: Thank you.
13	MR. GARCIA: In the case of
14	Muhammad versus Indiana Family and Social
15	Services Administration, Mr. Muhammad isn't
16	here, but this is quite clearly a more
17	clear-cut case, and I concur with the Deputy
18	Director's finding of reasonable cause does not
19	
	exist, and I would recommend a motion to
20	approve that finding.
21	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: May I have
22	a motion to accept that recommendation?
23	COMM. BAYNARD: So moved.

1	COMM CARTER Cogond
	COMM. CARTER: Second.
2	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: All in
3	favor?
4	COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.
5	COMM. CARTER: Aye.
6	COMM. BAYNARD: Aye.
7	COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.
8	COMM. GARCIA: Aye.
9	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Anyone
10	opposed?
11	(No response.)
12	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Thank you.
13	I'll skip mine and go to Commissioner Ramos.
14	COMM. CARTER: I've got one.
15	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: He's not
16	here. Do we have it? You have it. Okay.
17	COMM, CARTER: I have one.
18	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: All right.
19	COMM. CARTER: Okay. In the case
20	of Princess Spencer it's not on the
21	agenda Princess Spencer versus MJM
22	Investigations, Inc., I recommend that we
23	support the Deputy Director's no probable cause

1	finding.
2	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: May I have
3	a motion to accept that recommendation?
4	COMM. CRENSHAW: So moved.
5	COMM. BAYNARD: So moved.
6	COMM. CRENSHAW: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: And a
8	second? All right. Thank you very much. All
9	those in favor?
10	COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.
11	COMM. CARTER: Aye.
12	COMM. BAYNARD: Aye.
13	COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.
14	COMM. GARCIA: Aye.
15	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Anyone
16	opposed?
17	(No response.)
18	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Thank you.
19	Commissioner Gidney?
20	COMM. GIDNEY: Okay. I recommend
21	that we uphold the Director's findings of no
22	probable cause in the case of Escamilla versus
23	the Hammond Police Department.

	П
1	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: May I have
2	a motion to accept
3	COMM. CARTER: So moved.
4	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: the
5	Commissioner's recommendation?
6	COMM. BAYNARD: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: And all in
8	favor?
9	COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.
10	COMM. CARTER: Aye.
11	COMM. BAYNARD: Aye.
12	COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.
13	COMM. GARCIA: Aye.
14	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Anyone
15	opposed?
16	(No response.)
17	COMM. CRENSHAW: And I have one.
18	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: And you
19	have one.
20	COMM. CRENSHAW: In the case of
21	Hazel McGee versus Diamond Valley Chain, I
22	recommend to uphold the Deputy Director's
23	finding of no probable cause.

1	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: May I have
2	a motion to accept that recommendation?
3	COMM. GIDNEY: So moved.
4	COMM. CARTER: Second.
5	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: All in
6	favor?
7	COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.
8	COMM. CARTER: Aye.
9	COMM. BAYNARD: Aye.
10	COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.
11	COMM. GARCIA: Aye.
12	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Anyone
13	opposed?
14	(No response.)
15	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Thank you.
16	In the case of Barrand versus Ear, Nose
17	and Throat Associates, P.C., I move that we
18	uphold the Deputy Director's finding of no
19	probable cause in that case. May I have a
20	motion to accept that recommendation?
21	COMM. BAYNARD: So moved.
22	COMM. CARTER: Second.
23	CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: All in

favor? 1 2 COMM. GIDNEY: Aye. COMM. CARTER: Aye. 3 4 COMM. BAYNARD: Aye. 5 COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye. 6 COMM. GARCIA: Aye. 7 CHAIRPERSON BLACKBURN: Thank you. 8 I need to continue the case of 9 Weddle-Van Sickle versus Franklin Family 10 Restaurant. 11 Assignment for Commissioners to review 12 on appeal. Commissioner Carter, Fox versus 13 Tendercare Homes Health Services, Inc.; 14 Commissioner Baynard, McCray versus Wishard 15 Health Services; Commissioner Crenshaw, 16 Nicodemus versus Resort Condominiums International; Commissioner Garcia, Harris 17 18 versus Promex Technologies; Commissioner 19 Gidney, O'Brien versus Calltech Communications, 20 LLC. 21 I'm assuming these are two cases 22 assigned to Commissioner Ramos. I'll take one and Commissioner Carter will take one, so we'll 23